

know there are diverse views on this issue. We will try to work out an orderly procedure so that Members will be able to get their views out and considered in the Senate and do it in a timely way.

Again, I thank the two leaders and the Senator from Wyoming as well for his cooperation, as always.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. RES. 28

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, upon disposition of the House message on S. Con. Res. 70, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 731, S.J. Res. 28, a joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the FCC with respect to broadcast media ownership, the statutory time be reduced to 2 minutes equally divided and controlled between Senators DORGAN and STEVENS or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of the time, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the joint resolution; provided further that all remaining provisions of the statute remain in effect. I further ask that all statements relating to the matter be printed in the RECORD prior to the vote on this important piece of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Finally, as I understand, we have one more rollcall vote we are going to have now. There will be no votes tomorrow. This will be the last vote until Tuesday morning, unless someone has an objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to vote on a motion offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG, on discretionary spending.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, under the budget resolution, spending goes down each and every year as a share of domestic product, 20.8 percent down to 19.1 percent.

The Senator opposite seeks to make those reductions more steep and embrace the President's proposal which would eliminate the COPS Program—not just cut it but eliminate it, a program that puts 100,000 police on the street—cut the Weatherization Assistance Program 100 percent at a time of \$120 oil; cut the first responder grants—police, fire, emergency medical 78 percent; cut community development 24 percent; cut clean water 21 percent; cut LIHEAP 15 percent.

More than that, because of the way this amendment has been written, this would put defense in the pool to be cut. If you want to do that, vote for the Senator's motion. I urge a "no" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I have no charts. I simply have a number: \$1 trillion. We should draw the line somewhere around here. We should say to the American people: It is time that we exercise fiscal discipline. Let's do it at

\$1 trillion. That means that in this budget, you only have to reduce it 1 percent to get back underneath that number.

We don't have to look to the President to do that. We can't, amongst ourselves, come up with \$10 billion of savings on a \$1 trillion budget? If we can't, we should all go home.

Vote to draw the line at \$1 trillion. Vote for the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG.

Mr. GREGG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 135 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Allard	DeMint	Lugar
Barrasso	Dole	Martinez
Bayh	Domenici	McConnell
Bennett	Ensign	Murkowski
Bond	Enzi	Roberts
Brownback	Feingold	Sessions
Bunning	Graham	Shelby
Burr	Grassley	Smith
Cantwell	Gregg	Stevens
Chambliss	Hagel	Sununu
Coburn	Hatch	Thune
Cochran	Hutchison	Vitter
Coleman	Inhofe	Voinovich
Cornyn	Isakson	Warner
Craig	Klobuchar	Wicker
Crapo	Kyl	

NAYS—48

Akaka	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Johnson	Pryor
Bingaman	Kennedy	Reed
Boxer	Kerry	Reid
Brown	Kohl	Rockefeller
Byrd	Landrieu	Salazar
Cardin	Lautenberg	Sanders
Carper	Leahy	Schumer
Casey	Levin	Snowe
Collins	Lieberman	Specter
Conrad	Lincoln	Stabenow
Dodd	McCaskill	Tester
Dorgan	Menendez	Webb
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Corker	Obama
Clinton	McCain	

The motion was rejected.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BAUCUS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair appoints. Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. DOMENICI conferees on the part of the Senate.

DISAPPROVAL OF FCC OWNERSHIP RULE SUBMITTAL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 28, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S.J. Res. 28) disapproving the rules submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to broadcast media donorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes equally divided. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. This is a resolution of disapproval of an FCC rule dealing with media ownership. The Commerce Committee has passed this out to the floor of the Senate. I will not go into great length on the merits of the issue except to say we have visited this issue previously. I think there is too much concentration in the media. The FCC rule moves in exactly the wrong direction, adding more concentration.

I ask that Members of the Senate who wish to would be able to make statements that appear prior to this vote. I believe we have agreed to a voice vote.

I yield the floor. I reserve my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I know we are going to have a voice vote. I ask unanimous consent I be recorded as a "no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The record will so reflect.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish the record also to reflect I voted "no" on S.J. Res. 28.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent statements in opposition to the resolution of the Senator from North Dakota be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CROSS OWNERSHIP RULE

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I rise today to thank my colleague from North Dakota for his work on media ownership issues and to engage him in a colloquy to clarify one point about the resolution of disapproval. I note that Senator DORGAN has long been a champion of media localism and diversity, issues that are quite important to me as well.

Because I believe that the Federal Communications Commission ignored Congress's repeated admonitions about following appropriate processes in reaching the agency's new cross-ownership rules, I support this bipartisan resolution.

Yet I believe that if the Senate adopts this resolution, the existing waivers contemplated under the FCC cross-ownership rule should be protected. This means that those waivers would not be a part of this resolution.

I have significant concerns that if these waivers are not protected, this legislation could harm some media markets and constituents' access to news and information in my State of Virginia.

I would like to confirm that this resolution, while it would nullify the revised version of the FCC's newspaper cross-ownership ban, would not undo or in any manner change the FCC's decision to grant permanent waivers to five existing newspaper-broadcast combinations, and thus grandfather them, as set forth in paragraphs 77 and 158 of the FCC's December 18, 2007 Report and Order. It is my understanding that this resolution will not affect these five specific waivers, and I would like to clarify this understanding.

Senator DORGAN, is it your goal and understanding that the waivers that the FCC granted in conjunction with the cross-ownership rule be protected?

Mr. DORGAN. Under the Congressional Review Act, the resolution of disapproval is intended to overturn a specific rule, not other parts of an agency's order. The waivers are not rules.

The resolution is written in a specific way referring to an order, but it is the rule that is nullified. These waivers could have been granted alone or under the previous cross-ownership ban. It is not the intention of this resolution to affect the waivers in the order.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the resolution of disapproval that repeals the recent Federal Communications Commission's media ownership rulemaking.

As an original cosponsor of this measure, I applaud Senator DORGAN for once again taking the lead in introducing critical legislation to overturn a misguided attempt by the commission to relax crucial media ownership rules—a move that will only lead to further consolidation within the industry that will ultimately harm consumers.

As my colleagues are well aware, consolidation in the media market has led to fewer locally owned stations, and less local programming and content. Indeed, it speaks volumes that the number of independent radio owners has plunged in the past 11 years by 39 percent.

Just in 1996 and 1997 alone, more than 4,400 radio stations were sold following the first round of consolidation following passage of The Telecommunications Act of 1996. Between 1995 and 2003, ownership of the top 10 largest television stations increased from 104 owners to 299 owners.

At the same time, we know that locally owned stations aired more local news and programming than non-locally owned stations—and that is not

just me talking. That is according to the FCC's own studies, which also found that smaller station groups overall tended to produce higher quality newscasts compared to stations owned by larger companies.

So there should be no mistake—fewer independent, local stations mean less local content and programming.

Minority and women-ownership of media outlets are also at perilously low levels—currently only 6 percent of full-power commercial broadcast radio stations are owned by women and 7.7 percent are owned by minorities. Ownership of broadcast television is even lower—5 percent for women and only 3.3 percent for minorities. Instead of being a catalyst promoting localism and ownership diversity, the FCC's action will actually hasten the decline in these crucial areas.

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation last fall held a hearing to consider these very issues, and the actions required for improvement. During that hearing, I and several of my colleagues voiced strong concern about Chairman Martin's intent to ease current media ownership rules, particularly because of the potential impact on localism and diversity in broadcasting.

That is why I, along with many committee members, joined Senators DORGAN and LOTT in introducing The Media Ownership Act of 2007, which was reported out of the committee favorably in December. This constitutes yet another step in the mounting opposition to the loosening of these crucial rules. We had hoped that Chairman Martin would heed not only our urgings, but the concerns expressed by the American public, and complete the 4-year-old rulemaking on localism.

However, on November 13, less than a week after that hearing, the Chairman issued a new proposal to lift the 32-year-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership ban in the top 20 media markets. Worse still, the FCC allowed only 28 days for the public to comment on the proposal when it has historically provided 60 to 90 days on pivotal matters such as this.

Clearly, the FCC's actions demonstrate a litany of highly-misguided priorities that neglect to consider the full impact of the FCC's rule change on the American people. Therefore, this resolution of disapproval is necessary to rescind this haphazard approach.

I must say it feels a little like déjà vu all over again, when nearly 5 years ago the FCC attempted a similar effort to relax another set of media ownership rules. And fittingly, the opposition to the commission's attempt then mirrors the opposition that is coalescing now. And the action we are considering now is reminiscent of the joint resolution passed by the U.S. Senate in September 2003, which I cosponsored, condemning the Commission's efforts to rewrite those rules.

So that naturally begs the question—why would the commission continue to

attempt to weaken media ownership rules when the American public has vociferously opposed these efforts time and again? When the U.S. Congress in 2004 enacted a statute prohibiting the FCC from raising national ownership limits above 39 percent? When the Third Circuit Court of Appeals rejected as arbitrary and capricious this attempt at revising the rules after finding the FCC had no factual basis for the limits it set? We deserve an answer.

Many proponents for relaxing media ownership rules have pointed to the precipitous decline of the newspaper industry as the reason change is mandatory. They have even cited a recent report by the Newspaper Association of America, NAA, which found print ad revenue for the industry fell by 9.4 percent last year—the biggest decline since it started keeping records in 1950.

However, what these proponents are neglecting to mention is that the NAA also found that online newspaper advertising revenue increased 19 percent last year.

Furthermore the NAA president and CEO John Sturm stated “newspaper publishers are continuing to drive strong revenue growth from their increasingly robust Web platforms.” This hardly sounds like an industry in irreversible peril if this longstanding rule remains in place.

Opponents of this resolution will also argue that the FCC crafted a very narrow revision, lifting the cross-ownership ban for only the top 20 media markets, so this resolution is unnecessary. However, the FCC also adopted “four factors” and two broad “special circumstances” that would allow this ban to be lifted for a station in any media market.

These scenarios and factors include evaluating financial condition, possible increased local news, as well as existing market media concentration, and news independency. Given the vagueness and loopholes that exist with the rulemaking, the “high hurdle” that the Commission has supposedly set for proposed combinations could be easily cleared by using only a stepladder.

Preventing further media consolidation has been a bipartisan effort, and the resolution before us today is no different. We must not allow the indispensable role the media plays in promoting diversity and localism to be further marginalized and miniaturized by unchecked consolidation within the industry.

We owe it to the American people to restore confidence in the FCC's commitment not only to uphold the public interest but to advance it and strengthen it. That is why it is undeniably incumbent upon the commission members to revisit these rules and establish a set of standards that will effectively promote localism and minority and women-ownership, not more media consolidation. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today we are considering a critical

piece of legislation. The resolution of disapproval is critical to the diversity of our media and I would like to thank Senator DORGAN for his leadership on the issue. In December, the FCC pushed through new media ownership rules on a partisan three to two vote. The proposal strips newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rules that have protected diversity for 32 years in the top 20 markets.

This proposal has been described by the chairman as a modest rules change. That since it is restricted to the top 20 markets, and since it only applies to television stations not in the top 4 in ratings in those markets, its some sort of compromise. The reality is that is simply not true.

To begin with, 44 percent of Americans live in the top 20 markets. This includes my State of New Jersey, which is split by two of the largest markets in the country. And there are a number of loopholes in the rule. Companies looking to consolidate either outside the top 20 markets or to purchase one of the 4 largest stations need only be granted a waiver from the FCC.

The standards for granting these waivers are vague at best. Here is an example: one of the standards a company must show in order for a waiver to be granted is whether the broadcast station has enough editorial independence. How does anybody quantify that?

The fact is there is no way to objectively judge the parameters Chairman Martin's rule requires to grant the waivers. This means that depending on who is running the FCC, a waiver can be granted in any market or for any station. As Commissioner Adelstein put it so appropriately, this proposal is nothing more than a wolf in sheep's clothing.

While the FCC devotes its resources to opening up more loopholes for consolidation, the commission has done virtually nothing to address the issue of minority ownership. The reality of diversity in our Nation's broadcast ownership is a far cry from the reality in which we live.

Despite making up 35 percent of the population and owning roughly 18 percent of all nonfarm businesses, minorities currently own only 3 percent of all broadcast TV stations.

It is in the best interests of our democracy that media ownership reflect the wealth of this Nation's diversity. As a public trustee of the broadcast spectrum, it is the responsibility of the FCC to advocate on behalf of women and minorities.

Yet this Commission under President Bush has failed in this pursuit. In fact, the FCC has so mishandled the issue, nobody even uses their statistics on minority ownership anymore. The best estimates we have on minority ownership have to come from outside groups because the FCC simply doesn't have accurate reporting numbers.

In 2000, the FCC released five studies conducted to help the commission comply with its own regulations that re-

quire the elimination of market-entry barriers for small business. These studies largely found that media consolidation negatively impacted minority ownership, and noted that minority owners face historic barriers to accessing capital from lending institutions to purchase broadcast outlets. But rather than act on these studies to address the underlying problems, the FCC took 4 years to even issue a notice for public comment.

So today we have a chance to overturn a misguided decision by the FCC. And we have a chance to tell the Commission that rather than spend their time on finding loopholes for major media corporations to buy up more outlets throughout our country, the FCC should be working to its charge as the trustee for America's airwaves.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S.J. Res. 28, a joint resolution disapproving the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, rule relaxing newspaper-broadcast media cross-ownership.

Like many of my colleagues, I am deeply troubled by the FCC's rule-making that would allow greater consolidation of our media. The media is a tremendous force in our society. It can inform, educate, and entertain, as well as nourish our democratic dialogue. Unfortunately, the media also has less savory powers.

In recent years, we have seen an increase in coarse and violent programming, coupled with a decrease in local news and hardhitting journalism. To say these trends are not in the best interest of the American people, and especially our youngest citizens, is clearly an understatement.

In addition, as corporate ownership over our media grows more concentrated, we see less and less of the diversity of our Nation. When programming is the same from coast to coast, our airwaves will no longer reflect the rich mosaic of our country and our citizens. Such a landscape should prompt the FCC to act with an overabundance of caution, but it has not.

Five years ago, the FCC substantially relaxed the rules that govern media ownership in this country. Millions of Americans contacted the FCC to complain. The U.S. Senate voted to support a "resolution of disapproval" in response to the FCC's decision. Next, the courts got involved, and the Third Circuit Court of Appeals shipped the agency's handiwork right back to the FCC.

In 2006, the FCC began a new rule-making, and in November of 2007, the Commerce Committee held a hearing to discuss the effects of consolidation on localism and diversity in news and entertainment.

Over the following month, the Senate made clear to the Commission that it had serious concerns about the FCC's process and its apparent rush to issue a new rule. But on December 18, 2007, over the objections of Commissioners Michael Copps and Jonathan Adelstein,

the FCC approved a relaxed set of ownership rules under which newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership is permissible in the top 20 markets.

I commend Senator DORGAN for introducing S.J. Res. 28, a joint resolution disapproving the FCC rule. I am pleased to join him as a cosponsor of this resolution. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting S.J. Res. 28.

Together we can send a strong and united message that media diversity is clearly in the national interest and that the U.S. Senate will defend that interest with all the tools at its disposal.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask that I be recorded as voting no on S.J. Res. 28, a resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to broadcast media ownership.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the resolution of disapproval of the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, recently issued rules on media cross-ownership. I want to commend my colleague from North Dakota for his leadership on this most important of issues. This resolution will nullify the ill-considered and hastily-passed rules pushed through by the FCC in December of last year.

Over the last several years, the effects of media consolidation have become extremely clear to the American people: Less local control and community-oriented programming; less independently produced programming; fewer divergent views and opinions; fewer minority-owned broadcast stations.

And now, the FCC has green-lighted further media concentration by voting to overturn a 32-year-old rule prohibiting the cross-ownership of newspapers and broadcast stations—a rule that could impact markets in which nearly half of the American public lives and works.

Put simply, the FCC rule change would harm local and independent owners and help big media owners. In particular, the change further disadvantages minority media owners. While such owners control a mere 3 percent of the Nation's commercial TV stations, as many as 90 percent of minority media owners would be subject to these new rules. Further consolidation will simply reduce the number of opportunities for minorities to enter the market while putting those already in the market more at risk of being forced out by larger media conglomerates.

The FCC argues that this rule is necessary to "save" the newspaper industry. But as an internal FCC study showed, despite all the stories we are hearing about newspaper cutbacks, publicly traded newspapers earn 16 to 18 percent annual rates of return. An internal FCC memo found the industry as a whole to be profitable. That is to say nothing of the fact that the FCC has given no compelling reason for it to be in the newspaper business in the

first place. The FCC regulates the broadcast airwaves—and it should remain that way.

Perhaps most disturbing is the way the FCC went about implementing this radical new rule. First, it completely ignored Congress's bipartisan bill, the Media Ownership Act, of which I am a proud cosponsor. Then it ignored the public. Indeed, the Chairman's proposed rule changes were first made public in an op-ed he published in the New York Times outlining the changes for the first time—which might have been helpful had the public comment period not already closed the day his column appeared.

Public comments are not merely a formality, Mr. President—they are a vital piece of the rulemaking process and an integral part of responsive, open government. Five years ago, more than 3 million Americans spoke out when the FCC voted without any public input whatsoever to allow a single company to own up to three television stations, a local newspaper, a cable system, and as many as eight radio stations in a single media market. In large part because of the public outcry, the courts overturned the rules.

Mr. President, it isn't more consolidation and homogenization the American people want from their media—it is less. No one can seriously argue that the consolidation of the media in recent years has been a good development for the fourth estate. As coverage has become increasingly superficial, people wonder more than ever about the quality of the information they are receiving from the media. And quite frankly, I do not blame them.

Must we act to ensure the strength and vitality of the American media in the 21st century? Absolutely. But that should be accomplished within an open and transparent framework as prescribed in the Media Ownership Act—a process that gives the public a voice in this fight. As the Senator from North Dakota has said, "Localism and diversity of media ownership is vital in a democracy."

Indeed it is, Mr. President. It is time to tell the FCC that this is no way to maintain a free, open and diverse media, and I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask the Senator from Washington to use the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise, obviously, to encourage my colleagues here. This is an issue we dealt with before. While media consolidation might be good for Wall Street, it is not good for Main Street. The diversity of voices has been a key component to our society, and preserving them by making sure we don't have a consolidation of media is very important.

I urge my colleagues to disapprove of the FCC rule on media consolidation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 28

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to broadcast media ownership (Report and Order FCC 07-216), received by Congress on February 22, 2008, and such rule shall have no force or effect.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now be in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

MEDIA DIVERSITY

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, for those who may not have observed that voice vote, it was a very positive result for the voices of America supporting diversity. I want to spend a few minutes talking about this issue, to make sure we give it the due consideration that is important.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator from Washington will yield for a question. I have to leave the Chamber due to another event.

First, I thank the Senator from Washington. Senator CANTWELL has been unbelievably strong and supportive in getting us to this point of having passed the resolution of disapproval. We got it through the Commerce Committee. She was a leader in that effort. We now have voice voted it. It has passed the Senate.

I did want to say, as I said earlier, the issue here is simple. We have far too much concentration in the media. The Federal Communications Commission, at least the Chairman and two others who have been members, have become cheerleaders of more concentration. That means less localism. It means your local radio station, in many cases your television station, other media outlets, are run by somebody living 1,500 miles away, running homogenized music through a radio station having nothing to do with covering the local baseball team or news events. I think this moves in exactly the wrong direction. I believe there

needs to be more localism and I think there has to be a procedure on localism at the Federal Communications Commission. There need to be public interest standards with respect to broadcasters that do not now exist. The standards have been emasculated. We have a lot to do to put this back on track.

Suffice it to say, the FCC was anxious to move in the direction of more consolidation, allowing newspapers to buy up television stations. We have had a ban on that for three decades. We prohibited the cross ownership in a market. The reason we have done that is pretty simple: We don't want there to be only one or a couple of dominant voices in a market. We want there to be many voices.

That is what our purpose is, to bring this resolution of disapproval. It is unusual to do this, but we did it. It got through the Commerce Committee, now through the Senate. It says to the Federal Communications Commission, get things right, do things right, don't truncate these things and cut the American people out of this process.

We have also said today we believe this is moving in the wrong direction. Everybody says there are more voices out there in the Internet and cable channels and so on. More voices but the same ventriloquist. We had one person testify from Los Angeles who came and said in my office we have 48 cable channels. I went through who owns the channels—42 of them are owned by the same few companies and that is the problem with concentration.

I again thank the Senator from Washington. She has done a great job and I am proud to work with her and Senator SNOWE especially, on the other side, and Senator LOTT when he was here, to accomplish this result.

Ms. CANTWELL. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. The praise should go to Senator DORGAN for his leadership on this issue for the last year-plus time, continuing to make sure the Senate holds the FCC accountable for their actions, trying to pass a rule on media consolidation when they know there have been dissenting views all across America about this issue. Certainly there has been a dissent from the Senate.

The ownership of broadcast and print media does touch on some of the core values Americans hold for freedom of speech, open and diverse viewpoints, to have vibrant economic competition from a variety of sources, and local diversity.

Attention to diversity and localism has served our economy well and has also provided us a good civics lesson. These opportunities—when we hear from small companies, when we hear from minorities, when we hear from women—are the types of diversity we want to protect. We did that tonight.

The diversity in media does energize our democracy. Viewpoint diversity that comes from the various views that